



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

perverted doctrine of Plato is interesting and important. The test for him of the long line of pseudo-Platonists is that they lay hold of all the "imaginative and emotional elements of Platonism, but forget that the spiritual affirmation speaks from a dark recess of the soul." The true Platonist, on the other hand, knows that the divine spirit, like Socrates' dæmon, always speaks to check and inhibit, never in positive commands; only the false sectary imagines that the spirit bids him follow his desires and so turn liberty into license. If Dr. More is right here, and the reviewer believes that he is, his words deserve the careful consideration of every one who earnestly desires a guide to righteousness.

We have given so much space to this book because we believe that it is one of much importance to the readers of this REVIEW. Although some clergymen appear to feel that they have been called to everything save theology, the one subject which should be the intellectual basis of their calling, still theology remains the queen of the sciences; and no Greek thinker had so much influence on Christian thought as Plato. Therefore we commend to them the study of Dr. More's work.

Yet one curse must be pronounced upon it: *damnentur omnes qui indices omittunt.*

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LIBERAL JUDAISM AND HELLENISM. CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE. Macmillan & Co. 1918. Pp. xi, 328. 6s.

It is easy to define neither religion nor any organized expression of it. Even orthodoxy is constantly changing. Conservative Judaism is not what it was a century ago, while Mr. Montefiore's Liberal Judaism was then unknown. Jews have no authoritative ecclesiastical body to determine their creed or dictate their conduct, so that while on certain fundamentals all are agreed, Judaism for most of them is a matter of individual interpretation. Hence the warrant for Mr. Montefiore's attempt to define Liberal Judaism. It is not his first essay in this field. What is known as Reform Judaism began in Germany in the early part of the nineteenth century. Today the movement, strong as it is in America, knows little following in Europe. Judaism throughout Europe is most conservative. But Mr. Montefiore for a generation at least has been championing the cause of a liberal interpretation of his faith. In 1903 he published

his *Liberal Judaism*. In a prefatory note he stated that the essay "does not present the views of any existing organization or party, and no one but myself is responsible for any of the statements and opinions which it contains." He might make the same confession of his present volume. Indeed again and again he stresses the fact that neither officially nor unofficially is he the accredited representative or spokesman of any body of Jews. Yet there is no doubt that in many respects he voices the sentiment of a considerable number of his co-religionists.

Scholarly, Mr. Montefiore is profoundly religious. He is an intellectually religious enthusiast. Thoroughly modern, he has profound reverence for the past. He believes wholly in the higher criticism of even sacred literature, but it remains none the less sacred literature to him. He does not deny or attempt to gloss over the faults of the Old Testament, but he argues logically that its weaknesses do not neutralize its strength, that its faith is a matter of evolution, that its value should justly be determined not by its humble beginnings but by its remarkable achievements, its spiritual attainments. And so he finds warrant for his Liberal Judaism in the old Book of Books.

To the New Testament Mr. Montefiore applies the same test he uses with the Old. He makes clear what of the New Testament not even Liberal Judaism can endorse or accept. But he argues that it has much to offer which the Jew would do well seriously to consider. He presents the most reverent estimate of the character of Jesus, though explaining clearly why for ages neither he nor his teachings found favor among the Jews. Much that Jesus taught, the Jews had known before his time. Yet Jesus, he contends, complements Jewish teaching in many ways, and presents it in more intense, more gripping, and therefore more appealing fashion. It is indeed the very intensity, the enthusiasm of Jesus that accounts to us for what we usually term his impracticable idealism. And yet is idealism ever impracticable?

Even Rabbinism can serve the cause of Liberal Judaism. For Judaism has never been static, so that after the Canon was closed the story of the faith was continued. "Rabbinic morality is common-sense morality shot through with idealism." It "smoothed the rough moral and religious edges of the Old Testament." Independently it found some of the development contained in the New Testament.

For the spiritual achievements of Hellenism Mr. Montefiore has the profoundest admiration. "No religion can live in the Western world which has not settled accounts with Hellenism." He traces interestingly the relation between Judaism and Hellenism, shows how Hellen-

ism has indelibly affected Judaism (and Christianity too, for that matter), and urges on his people a more cordial welcome of the finer contributions which Hellas has made to religious thought. Liberal Judaism, he is certain, will not be wanting in this needed hospitality.

For these many reasons, the author holds, Liberal Judaism need not fear the trying times that are upon us. Whatever political, social, industrial changes come to pass, Liberal Judaism will survive. It too will change, will expand, will probably become more liberal, abandoning, it may be, some of the things it now urges, admitting newer truths, newer revelations, but loving always truth, the universal truth, that relates every man, of every faith and land, to God, the truth that will endure and bless.

Mr. Montefiore's appeal for a liberal, spiritual, universal faith, one that will embrace all truth and all men, that will bring God to man and man to God, that will unite men in the common service of God and man, is well-nigh irresistible. And though it may be too eclectic for our denominational day, still it points the way and is bound to serve the cause to which it addresses itself. And especially now, when because of the war, on the one hand, men are asking as to the relation of religion to life, the justification of religion in the face of what has taken place, and on the other, are religiously drawing nearer to each other. Is not this the day for a frank, logical, liberal restatement of religion, call it by whatever name you will?

And so the liberal Jew applauds Mr. Montefiore's message, though where details are concerned he may have to part company with him. It is difficult, for example, to understand why, considering its program, Liberal Judaism, justifying as it does the retention of ceremonies that still have religious significance, should hold fast even for "reasons of a social and juridical order" to rites that no longer have religious or, for that matter, even hygienic warrant (p. 69). Why retain Biblical passages whose message we have completely outgrown? And what right have we to reinterpret them, giving them a meaning we know they were not intended to convey, simply that we may go on using them (p. 68)? Mr. Montefiore is here no more convincing than in his insistence that passages from the New Testament, however beautiful and deeply religious, even when they present a point of view finer than that of the Old Testament, must not be used by Jews: "They belong to another theology, another religion, even to another world of religious thought than ours" (p. 114). True. But how can the liberal Jew of Mr. Montefiore's type harmonize his admiration and enthusiasm for these teachings with his insistence that we who are Jews dare not make use of them?

Mr. Montefiore regrets that the Pirke Aboth is contained in no liberal Jewish ritual. A condensed version is to be found in the Union Prayer Book issued by the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Justly he deplores the fact that so little of Rabbinical literature is accessible to the English-speaking public. The Jewish Publication Society of America is planning now to meet the need. There is a typographical error in the note on p. 86: "Dr. J. Kohler" should read "Dr. K. Kohler."

HARRY LEVI.

TEMPLE ISRAEL, BOSTON.

ST. PAUL'S FIGHT FOR GALATIA. C. H. WATKINS. The Pilgrim Press. 1914. Pp. 312.

In this book Dr. Watkins presents to English readers in a somewhat expanded form a thesis that was accepted by the University of Heidelberg for a Doctorate of Theology. (Published in 1913 by Mohr, Tübingen, under the title of *Der Kampf des Paulus um Galatien*.) He speaks in his preface of particular indebtedness to his chief theological teacher, the late Professor Johannes Weiss, to whom, along with Dr. Alexander Souter, sometime Professor in Mansfield College, Oxford, the work is dedicated. It should be stated, however, that while he doubtless owes much to these teachers in the way of stimulus and suggestion, his conclusions are the fruit of his own independent investigation. In not a few instances he has not hesitated to reject as untenable emendations and interpretations that were championed by his Heidelberg preceptor.

The material of the thesis is arranged in three main divisions. Part I deals with The Present Struggle in Galatia (pp. 16-152); Part II with The Previous Stages of the Struggle (pp. 155-260); and Part III with General Observations on the Cogency and Justice of the Epistle, the Personal and Polemical Characteristics of the Apostle manifested therein, and the probable Success of his Efforts (pp. 263-312).

It is the earlier part of the work that will be found of particular interest. The opening chapter deals with the style of Galatians. An effort is made to trace from sentence to sentence the alternations of Paul's emotion resulting from his surprise, disappointment, or chagrin at the threatened ruin of his labor. This psychological analysis is often over-subtle. Paul's emotional fluctuations can hardly have been as abrupt and transitory as is here imagined. Such